DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 729 CS 003 952

AUTHOR Asplund, Bennett; Benolken, David
TITLE Bryant Junior High School Concentrated Education Center Reading Program.
INSTITUTION Minneapolis Public Schools, Minn.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE [74]
NOTE 28p.; See ED112346 for "Effective Reading Programs: Summaries of 222 Selected Programs

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educationally Disadvantaged; *Individualized Instruction; Junior High Schools; *Reading Comprehension; Reading Improvement; Reading Skills; *Remedial Reading Programs; *Sequential Programs; *Vocabulary Skills; Word Recognition
IDENTIFIERS *Effective Reading Programs; *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; Right to Read

ABSTRACT

This report, included in "Effective Reading Programs...," describes a Title I sequential reading support program for educationally disadvantaged junior high school students and analyzes the vocabulary and reading comprehension test results of this program for the school year 1972-1973. After group and individual pretesting in reading and math, students were assigned to the following groups: those lacking word or letter recognition, those lacking reading comprehension, those reading at the fifth grade level who needed reading grade level improvement, and those reading within a year of grade level who required no special program. The reading teachers of the support team offered services within the classroom setting and on an individual basis every hour of the school day. In addition, staffing with the student, the classroom teacher, and other involved personnel was a key element in the individualized program. After eight months, the Gates-MacGinitie Vocabulary and Comprehension tests were administered to both Title I and non-Title I students, grades seven through nine. Generally, Title I students increased in grade level from five to eight months. The report includes six tables of test results and an analysis of each table. (HAI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED151729

Minneapolis Public Schools
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413

Bryant Junior High School
Concentrated Education Center
Reading Program

Melvin G. West, Principal
Bennett Asplund, David Benolken
Writer/Coordinators

CS003952

INTRODUCTION

This report covers the operations of the Reading Support Programs currently in operation at Bryant Junior High School, Minneapolis Public Schools, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Materials used to prepare this report come from the planning done by the support team, (composed of all the remedial reading, special education, and Title I faculty), and from the latest (1972-1973) evaluation report prepared by the Research Department of the Minneapolis Public Schools. The data describing the Target Area of the school district; the project school; and the actual test results come from the evaluation report completed by the Research Department.

Beginning with the 1973-1974 school year two major changes occurred affecting our ability to report independently evaluated test data after the 1972-1973 school year. One change is that the Federal Government no longer required individual evaluation reports from Title I projects, but rather one report dealing with the total Title I effort of the school district. The second change deals with grade level composition of the project school. Initiation of the district Desegregation/Integration Plan called for Bryant Junior High to become a seventh-eighth grade center in order to become a more racially balanced school. This dropped the minority percentage from 46% to 32%. Any data that we have on the "new population", and the evaluation of such data, is strictly our own.

TARGET AREA

The Target Area is a portion of the core city of Minneapolis where the schools are eligible to receive benefits from programs funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.(ESEA). A school is eligible to receive Title I aid if the percentage of families residing in that school's district which receives AFDC payments (in excess of $2,000 a year) - or has an annual income under $2,000 - exceeds the citywide percentage for families in those categories.

In 1972-1973, nearly 26,871 children attended the 25 elementary schools, five junior highs, three senior highs and seven parochial schools that were eligible to receive this aid. One third of these students were from minority groups and one third were defined by the State Department of Education as educationally disadvantaged, i.e. one or more grade levels behind in basic skills such as reading and arithmetic. Federal programs are concentrated on the educationally disadvantaged group.

According to 1970 census data, over 170,000 persons resided in the Target Area. Of that group, 11% were black and 3½% were Indian, more than double the citywide percentage of minority group members. Over 50% of the Target Area residents over 25 years old had not completed high school, compared to the 35% of the non-Target Area residents who did not have high school diplomas. One out of five Target Area residents over the age of 25 had gone to college, and 9% had completed four or more years. One out of four of the non-Target Area residents had gone to college, and 15% had completed four or more years.

The income for an average Target Area family was $9,113 in 1970, about $2,000 less than the citywide average. The homes they lived in had an average value of $10,385, over 40% less than the average value of a single family

residence in Minneapolis. One out of five Target Area children between the ages of 6 and 17 was a member of a family that was below the poverty level, while only 6% of the non-Target Area children had such a family status.

THE PROJECT SCHOOL

Bryant Junior High School, located in the Target Area, serves many students who come from lower-income and one-parent families. During 1972-1973 over 50% of the students enrolled at the school were minority group members.

The need for special support services at Bryant has been indicated by a number of criteria. Based on economic factors - Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), welfare and poverty level incomes - half of the school population is disadvantaged. Standardized test score results in previous years have indicated that the median scores of students in all grades fall a year or more below grade level. To help meet the needs of these economically and educationally disadvantaged students, a Concentrated Education Center (CEC) was created at Bryant with Title I and local funds in 1969. These CEC funds have been used to hire additional teachers, aides and clerks, and to develop and expand various programs aimed at basic skills remediation.

During the 1972-1973 school year, the Bryant CEC operated on a budget of $167,913, all of which was provided by the Federal Government under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. 76% of the budget was used to help pay the salaries of the nine full-time and 21 part-time staff members.

This study reports the progress made by Bryant seventh and eighth grade students on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests and the Minneapolis Arithmetic Computation Test over the eight month period from mid-September 1972 to mid-May 1973.

During the 1972-1973 school year 925 pupils were enrolled at Bryant. There were 75 sixth graders, 300 seventh graders, 270 eighth graders and 280 ninth graders. Because Bryant is now a seventh-eighth grade center, only the test scores of seventh and eighth graders with both pre and post test results who attended Bryant the entire school year were analyzed.

The tests were administered under normal testing conditions by the Bryant staff and were hand scored at the school. The results were then entered on individual student information sheets which were sent to the Research Department for processing and analysis in June 1973. These sheets also contained attendance data.

Gates-MacGinitie Vocabulary Test

The Vocabulary Test samples the student's reading vocabulary. This test has 50 items, each consisting of a test word followed by five other words, one of which is similar in meaning to the test word. The student's task is to choose the word which is more nearly synonymous to the test word. The first items are composed of easy, commonly used words. Generally, the words become less common and more difficult as the test progresses. The test is a "power" test and has a 15 minute time limit.

Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension Test

This test measures the student's ability to read complete prose passages with understanding. It contains 21 passages and 52 blank spaces, with each blank space having five possible completions. A student must decide which one of the five completions best conforms to the meaning of the whole passage. The first passages are simply written, but the later ones become progressively more difficult. The test is also a "power" test and has a 25 minute time limit.

Minneapolis Arithmetic Computation Test

This is a 33-item test designed by Minneapolis Public School personnel that measures the students' ability to perform a variety of mathematical computations involving addition, subtraction, multiplication and division of whole numbers, decimals, fractions and percents. A student must solve each problem and enter the answer in the blank space provided. The problems become progressively more difficult. This is a "power" test and students are given a class period in which to finish it.

CHAPTER TWO: SUPPORT SERVICES TEAM

In 1970 the faculty, students, parents and community of Bryant Junior High created a new atmosphere in a school that only a few years before was torn by strife and student unrest. The new atmosphere was one that was to become truly responsive to the needs of the student body and at the same time be responsive and sensitive to all of the other factions that make up the total Bryant community.

The new atmosphere took the form of three schools within a school. The faculty and the students were divided into three semi-autonomous units called houses. Each house had its own assistant principal, counselor, social worker and clerk along with its own teaching faculty and approximately 300 students. The teaching core was made up of two social studies, two English, two mathematics, one science, one art, and one physical education teacher. Representatives from industrial education, home economics, foreign language, and music,rotated themselves between houses since their specialties and special instructional areas had to be shared throughout the total school. Each house also had a remedial reading teacher, one or two SLBP teachers and one special education teacher.

After one year of operation under this format it became evident that, while the system worked well within the regular academic structures, success was lacking in the skill remediation effort. The student body's median reading level fell below the fifth grade. The median for mathematics was equally as low. The task before the support team was challenging. The school-wide thrust going into the second year was to bring about a change in the basic skill level of all students.

Looking at the new thrust as a mandate for change, the SLBP, MR, TITLE I, and reading departments, began, in the spring of 1971, to look at possible directions and alternatives that would bring these four departments together. The first step was to evaluate the programs being offered and to decide which warranted further expansion. The second step was to look at those areas in which the depart ments were ineffective and to discover why.

One of the first issues to arise was the duplication of effort across the four departments in the area of reading instruction. The duplication was not only in the methods and goals of each group, but it was also discovered that the same students were receiving help from all four groups.

The first task was to develop a sequential reading support program that allowed each department to operate in its strongest area. Both the SLBP and MR departments were doing similar things with youngsters who were unable to decode the language. Perceptual and behaviorial data also were considered as components of these students' inability to "decode". Since these youngsters were at the beginning stages of reading and were being carefully brought along to a point of true reading independence, this seemed like a natural starting point for the sequence.

At the same time, the nature of the program offered by the reading teachers was primarily one of reading comprehension and required students who could phonetically handle the language. This then became the second step in the sequence, while

the third step became the comprehension program made available through the Dorsett three-button response reading machines. The Dorsett program had proven to be most successful with those youngsters whose comprehension abilities were at appoximately the fifth grade.

In keeping with the philosophy of the Bryant Plan to make better use of the human resources and the thrust to improve basic skills, the support team proposed that their major emphasis would be (1) to plan support services given to both small groups ou'side of the regular classroom setting and directly to students and teachers within the regular classroom; (2) by working across house lines, the support services could be provided every hour of the day; and (3) coordination of all services through a coordinator.

CHAPTER THREE: ASSESSMENT AND SUPPLEMENTARY TESTING

The testing program for the beginning of the year is carried out in two phases. The first phase involves the administration of group tests in reading and mathematics to all students. The results are used as a pretest base line from which to measure achievement during the school year and as a coarse indicator of the need for supportive services. The Gates MacGinitie Reading Test Form D is administered to the seventh graders and Form E is administered to the eighth graders. The math level is measured by the Minneapolis Arithmetic Computational Test which is administered to both grades.

Phase two is carried out through the administering of a variety of individual diagnostic instruments. Some of the instruments that are used: Jastak, Basic Skill Center Reading Placement Test, Form C, Gallistell-Ellis Key Math, and the Malcomesius. Psychological services offer further testing for referred students.

During the weeks needed to complete the assessing and screening, the support team teachers do not have student/classroom responsibilities. Regular class size during this time is inflated to around 30 students on the average. Support team teachers are in and out of classrooms during this time observing students and discussing students with the teachers. At the end of the testing period, the support classes will bring the average class size down to about 25.

CHAPTER FOUR: STAFFING

One of the key elements in the total Bryant program is weekly staffing time. Teachers may refer any student for whom they have any specific concerns to the social worker, who will then add the student to the staffing list. All of the teachers who come in contact with the youngster are asked to meet for about 20 minutes and discuss, class period by class period, how the youngster is operating in each subject area. The assistant principal and counselor are also present and add their input relative to their individual dealings with the youngster.

If the staffing information shows that a serious problem exists, a plan will be developed and a follow-up staffing will be schedualed. Oftentimes, a plan is not necessary since the concern or concerns were answered in the information shared by the staff members. Many teachers have found that just the sharing of information gives them some new information for use in their own classroom. The staffing also makes everyone more aware of the youngster for the next week or so. The extra awareness often is all that is necessary to reduce the problem.

There is an additional staffing session held each week, just for youngsters who are receiving special education support and/or reading and math support. This staffing procedure is required by the district special education guidelines, and the personnel present includes the school psychologist, counselor, social worker and special education teachers as well as appropriate classroom teachers.

A parent who is concerned about how their youngster is performing in school may request a staffing and be present for the discussion. Depending on known problems or contacts the staff may have with outside agencies, agency representatives are also invited from time to time to be present at a staffing.

Approximately six students are staffed every week, resulting in a large variety of plans. The plans may include changing of class schedules; placement in a peer group formed for working on various problems; a self-awareness group; drug group; career exploration group; or a particular staff person who has previously established a relationship with the student may take the student on as a personal project. The results are not always 100% successful, but each step helps the student-teacher, teacher-student, student-student, teacher-teacher relationships, leading eventually to a more responsive atmosphere.

CHAPTER FIVE: READING SEQUENCE

As a result of the testing program at the beginning of the year, the support team is able to make some general classification of students. Basically the considerations fall into four areas:

1. Reading at or within a year of grade level - no program is necessary
2. Reading at approximately the fifth grade level -
   a. eighth grader - possible candidate for the Dorsett program
   b. seventh grader - possible candidate for the Job Corps program
3. Reading between 4.0 and 5.0 - possible candidates for the Job Corps program
4. Reading below 4.0 - individually screened for possible small group instruction

The screening procedure is the heart of the placement decision making process. The funding received through ESEA Title I and those received through the state

for Special Education, both require that the youngster with the greatest need is serviced first. The screening procedure insures that we do identify, as well as humanly possible, those youngsters with the greatest need and then begin placing them according to a need priority. The diagnostic tools used are those recommended by the district Special Education office.

Having made our general classifications, our diagnostic procedure begins with those youngsters falling below 4.0. Those youngsters who have a defineable learning disability and/or a severe behavior problem as defined by the support team in consultation with the school psychologist, are assigned to the special education teachers. Their reading and emotional needs are met through individually designed programs.

Those youngsters who may have need for a program dealing with word or even letter recognition and who are not visually, auditorially, or motorically handicapped, or severe behavior problems, can normally find success through the ESAA (Emergency School Aid Act) program. This program makes use of the three-button response, audio-visual reading machines distributed by the Dorsett Educational Corporation. The Minneapolis Public Schools' Basic Skills Centers have developed a word and letter recognition program with filmstrips and tapes that is compatible with the Dorsett machines.

In dealing with those youngsters in need of small group instruction in word and letter recognition, a resource other than Special Education and the ESAA program was needed. Youngsters who could not be placed in a Special Education program because of lack of space (State law forbids a special education teacher from dealing with more than fifteen students) and those youngsters who do not qualify for the ESAA program are turned over to the Title I Supplementary teachers. These teachers can provide programs similar to those provided by the special education

teachers and many times can do so with greater flexibility.

Some of the youngsters in the below 4.0 group, actually have a good handle on the phonetics of the language and are handicapped more in their reading comprehension. These youngsters as well as those between 4.0 and 5.0 are screened and placed in the Job Corps program. This program was originally developed for the Federal Job Corps camps and is aimed at seventeen and eighteen year olds. The program is made up of a variety of materials from several publishers and has been put together by using a common readability formula. The material is assigned to eight levels with grade equivalents from 3.5 to 7.5. The entire program from placement tests to level advancement checks has been systematized and used a flowchart so that the student has a defined sequence to follow that allows him to choose from a wide range of reading interest levels. The four thousand stories in the collection give the students many options as to topics plus a rich variety of reading formats.

The fourth major component to the total reading support structure is the regular Dorsett Educational Corporation material used with the three-button response machines. The Dorsett machine, resembling a small television set, contains a filmstrip projector and record player. The Dorsett Company also added a cassette player to each machine to accommodate lessons produced by the Minneapolis Public Schools Basic Skills Centers. Each lesson for an audiovisual machine such as the Dorsett consists of both a filmstrip and a synchronized soundtrack. For each frame of the filmstrip there is a soundtrack-presented comment or question. If a question is asked, the student responds by pressing one of three buttons.

The materials, both for comprehension and vocabulary development, are best suited for students reading at approximately the fifth grade level. In the sequence,

we reserve this portion of the program primarily for the eighth graders who have been in the Job Corps Program as seventh graders and are still in need of some additional support. The filmstrip-record format gives continuous audio reinforcement, and the machine itself is a motivational factor for the reluctant reader. The previous training in the Job Corps program gives the Dorsett students a solid foundation from which they can extend their reading capabilities.

In summary, the reading support structure follows a sequence, in ascending order, from small group instruction for emphasizing decoding skills through the commercially produced Dorsett materials. At the same time, no matter where a youngster is placed, ongoing team planning and staffing allow for changing programs whenever it seems to be in the best interest of the youngster to do so.

CHAPTER SIX: SCHEDULING

The students who are placed in a support program are taken out of a previously scheduled class. With the exception of math, the staff feels that a reading support group is a worthy substitute for any other class in the total curriculum. The choice of class is left up to the student.

Students tend to choose the class in which they are the most uncomfortable. About two-thirds of the time the class chosen is either English or Social Studies, since these classes normally have the greatest amount of assigned reading.

Sometimes, because of the teacher's schedule or because of the severity of the reading problem, more changes are necessary in a student's class schedule. Particularly in those cases where the problem is quite severe, the support team teachers will attempt to place the students with regular classroom teachers who are sympathetic to students with learning problems and have made special materials or projects available within their curriculum.

As a result of the special considerations being made in the area of scheduling, youngsters are given an optimum chance for success. Their personal input into selecting the class they will give up in order to take part in a reading program allows them to make a personal commitment to their reading program. It also gives them a voice in planning their own program for reading improvement.

Results of the Gates-MacGinitie Vocabulary Test

Table 1, on the following page, reports the results of the Gates-MacGinitie Vocabulary Test, Survey D, for 219 Bryant seventh graders, or about 73 percent of the seventh grade enrollment at Bryant in 1972-73. The table also shows the test results for these students when they were identified as Title I and non-Title I students, and, in the case of the Title I students, when they were further sub-grouped by house.

The table reveals that the Title I seventh graders were over two years below grade level on the pre-test, while the non-Title I students had a pre-test grade equivalent score of the eighth year, fifth month and ranked at the 83rd percentile when compared with the publisher's sixth grade October norms.

The non-Title I students gained three months and were still substantially above grade level on the post test. One possible reason for this small gain is regression toward the mean, or the tendency for students who score exceptionally high on a pre-test to score lower on the post-test. Another reason may be test reliability. Because a substantial number of students had pre-test scores approaching the test limit of 50 points, the post-test may not have accurately measured student knowledge.

Table 1

Mean Raw Scores, Grade Equivalents, Publisher Percentiles and Gains for Bryant 7th Grade Students on the Gates-MacGinitie Vocabulary Test, Survey D, Mid-September 1972 Pretest and Mid-May 1973 Posttest

		Pre	Post	Gain
All Students	(N=219)			
Mean Raw Score		29.8	32.1	2.3
Grade Equivalent		5.6	6.0	.4
Publisher Percentile		38	38	0
Non-Title I Students	(N=88)			
Mean Raw Score		39.3	40.1	.8
Grade Equivalent		8.5	8.8	.3
Publisher Percentile		83	79	-4
Title I Students	(N=131)			
Mean Raw Score		24.4	27.4	3.0
Grade Equivalent		4.5	5.0	.5
Publisher Percentile		21	19	-2
A House Title I Students	(N=80)			
Mean Raw Score		23.6	28.2	4.6
Grade Equivalent		4.5	5.1	.6
Publisher Percentile		21	21	0
B House Title I Students	(N=51)			
Mean Raw Score		25.6	26.3	.7
Grade Equivalent		4.8	4.8	0
Publisher Percentile		23	17	-6

Table 2

Mean Raw Scores, Grade Equivalents, Publisher Percentiles and Gains for Bryant 8th Grade Students on the Gares-MacGinitie Vocabulary Test, Survey E, Mid-September 1972 Pretest and Mid-May 1973 Posttest

		Pre	Post	Gain
All Students	(N=183)			
Mean Raw Score		18.2	20.8	2.6
Grade Equivalent		6.6	7.6	1.0
Publisher Percentile		27	33	6
Non-Title I Students	(N=87)			
Mean Raw Score		23.1	25.7	2.6
Grade Equivalent		8.3	9.1	.8
Publisher Percentile		50	57	7
Title I Students	(N=96)			
Mean Raw Score		13.7	16.3	2.6
Grade Equivalent		5.1	5.9	.8
Publisher Percentile		13	15	2
A House Title I Students	(N=53)			
Mean Raw Score		12.3	15.3	3.0
Grade Equivalent		4.7	5.6	.9
Publisher Percentile		8	12	4
B House Title I Students	(N=43)			
Mean Raw Score		15.4	17.6	2.2
Grade Equivalent		5.6	6.4	.8
Publisher Percentile		17	20	3

Considering that the normal student could be expected to gain eight months over the elapsed period between the pre- and post-test, the Bryant Title I students did not do particularly well on this test. As a group they gained five months. The 81 A-House students gained six months while the 51 B-House students failed to make grade equivalent gains, on the average.

Bryant eighth graders, however, did better on the more difficult Survey E of the Gates-MacGinitie Vocabulary Test. Table 2 on page 15 shows that as a group they gained 2.6 raw score points and made a grade equivalent gain of one year. Like their seventh grade counterparts, the eighth grade Title I students had a pre-test grade equivalent score well below grade level -- in their case, almost three years below.

The Title I students gained eight months for the year for a post-test grade equivalent score of the fifth grade, ninth month. The B-House students had a post-test grade equivalent score of the sixth grade, fourth month, eight months higher than the post-test grade equivalent score of the A-House students.

Table 3, on the next page, presents the grade equivalent gains breakdown for the seventh and eighth grade students on the Gates-MacGinitie Vocabulary Test.

The table reveals that 54 percent of the seventh graders and 49 percent of the eighth graders made gains less than what an average or typical student might make (.8 gain). Twenty-four percent of the seventh graders and 34 percent of the eighth graders made gains of 1.5 or more.

Table 3

Number and Percent Breakdown of Grade Equivalent Gain Category for Bryant 7th and 8th Grade Students on the Gates-MacGinitie Vocabulary Test Mid-September 1972 Pretest and Mid-May 1973 Posttest

7th Grade Vocabulary, Survey D

Grade Equivalent Gains	All 7th Grade N=219		Title I 7th N=131		Non-Title I 7th N=88		A House N=80		B House N=51	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2.5 or more	16	7%	10	8%	6	7%	6	8%	4	8%
1.5 - 2.4	38	17	20	15	18	20	13	16	7	14
.8 - 1.4	46	21	31	24	15	17	24	30	7	14
.1 - .7	47	21	36	27	11	13	24	30	12	24
No gain or regressed	72	33	34	26	38	43	13	16	21	41
Total[2]	219	99%	131	100%	88	100%	80	100%	51	101%

8th Grade Vocabulary, Survey E

Grade Equivalent Gains	All 8th Grade N=183		Title I 8th N=96		Non-Title I 8th N=86		A House N=53		B House N=43	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2.5 or more	25	14%	17	18%	8	9%	12	23%	5	12%
1.5 - 2.4	37	20	18	18	19	22	11	21	7	16
.8 - 1.4	32	17	13	14	19	22	6	11	7	16
.1 - .7	29	16	14	16	14	16	3	6	11	25
No gain or regressed	60	33	34	35	26	30	21	40	13	30
Total	183	100%	96	101%	86	99%	53	101%	43	99%

[2]Percent totals in some report tables do not equal 100 because of rounding.

Over 50 percent of the Title I seventh graders and half of the Title I eighth graders failed to make an eight-month gain. Fifty-four percent of the A-House Title I seventh graders gained eight months or more while only 36 percent of the B-House seventh graders gained that much.

The gains for the Title I eighth graders were spread more equally between the two houses. Fifty-five percent of the A-House students and 44 percent of the B-House students gained eight months or more. Twelve A-House students (23 percent) made gains of 2.5 years or more.

Results of the Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension Test

The comprehension portion of the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test is used by the Bryant staff to determine pupil eligibility for Title I program benefits. Students scoring one year or more below grade level on the pre-test are Title I eligible. Of the 215 Bryant seventh graders with pre- and post-comprehension test scores in 1972-73, 132 students, or 60 percent, were Title I eligible on the pre-test. About 54 percent of the eighth graders were eligible.

Table 4, on the following page, reports the results of the Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension Test, Survey D, for the seventh graders.

The table reveals that the seventh graders did quite well on this test. Their pre-test grade equivalent score was 5.0, two years below grade level. They gained one full year over the eight month span between the pre- and post-test.

The Title I students made very good gains -- 1.2 years. However, their post-test score, 5.2, was still considerable below grade level. The 80 A-House students gained one year and three months while the 52 B-House students gained a year.

Table 4

Mean Raw Scores, Grade Equivalents, Publisher Percentiles and Gains for Bryant 7th Grade Students on the Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension Test, Survey D, Mid-September 1972 Pre-Test and Mid-May 1973 Post-Test

		Pre	Post	Gain
All Students	(N=215)			
Mean Raw Score		31.5	37.8	6.3
Grade Equivalent		5.0	6.0	1.0
Publisher Percentile		29	37	8
Non-Title I Students	(N=83)			
Mean Raw Score		46.1	46.6	.5
Grade Equivalent		9.3	9.7	.4
Publisher Percentile		82	78	-4
Title I Students	(N-132)			
Mean Raw Score		22.6	32.9	10.3
Grade Equivalent		4.0	5.2	1.2
Publisher Percentile		16	24	8
A-House Title I Students	(N-80)			
Mean Raw Score		23.1	34.1	11
Grade Equivalent		4.0	5.3	1.3
Publisher Percentile		16	27	11
B-House Title I Students	(N-52)			
Mean Raw Score		21.9	31.1	9.2
Grade Equivalent		3.9	4.9	1.0
Publisher Percentile		16	21	5

The non-Title I students had a post-test grade equivalent score of the seventh month of the ninth grade and ranked at the 78th percentile when compared with the publisher's sixth grade May norms.

Table 5 indicates the Bryant eighth graders made exceptional gains on the more difficult Survey E of the Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension Test. As a group they gained one year and three months and had a grade equivalent score of 7.8 on the post-test.

The non-Title I students gained one year and one month and with a grade equivalent score of 9.9 on the post-test, were well above grade level. The Title I students gained eight raw score points for a grade equivalent gain of one year and seven months. The 54 A-House Title I students gained 1.9 years while the B-House students gained 1.5 years -- both excellent gains.

Table 6 presents the grade equivalent gains breakdown for seventh and eighth grade students on the Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension Test.

The table shows that 128 seventh graders had grade equivalent gains of eight months or more. Forty-four of these students gained between 1.5 and 2.4 years while another 44 students made gains of 2.5 years or more. Thirty percent of the seventh graders made no gains or regressed.

Nearly 75 percent of the Title I students made average (.8) or better gains. Thirty-one Title I students gained between 1.5 and 2.4 years while 30 students gained 2.5 years or more. Only 14 percent of the Title I students made no gain.

When analyzed by house, the grade equivalent gains of the Title I students are even more remarkable. Over 80 percent of the A-House students gained eight months or more. One out of four students gained 2.5 years or more and only six

Table 5

Mean Raw Scores, Grade Equivalents, Publisher Percentiles and Gains for Bryant 8th Grade Students on the Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension Test, Survey E, Mid-September 1972 Pre-test and Mid-May 1973 Post-test

	Pre	Post	Gain
All Students (N=182)			
Mean Raw Score	27.3	32.9	5.6
Grade Equivalent	6.5	7.8	1.3
Publisher Percentile	27	34	7
Non-Title I Students (N=85			
Mean Raw Score	37.7	40.7	3.0
Grade Equivalent	8.8	9.9	1.1
Publisher Percentile	57	61	4
Title I Students (N=97)			
Mean Raw Score	18.2	26.2	8.0
Grade Equivalent	4.5	6.2	1.7
Publisher Percentile	12	18	6
A-House Title I Students (N=54)			
Mean Raw Score	15.4	24.7	9.3
Grade Equivalent	4.0	5.9	1.9
Publisher Percentile	7	16	9
B-House Title I Students (N=43)			
Mean Raw Score	20.6	26.9	6.3
Grade Equivalent	5.0	6.5	1.5
Publisher Percentile	15	21	6

Table 6

Number and Percent Breakdown of Grade Equivalent Gain Category for Bryant 7th and 8th Grade Students on the Gates-McGinitie Comprehension Test Mid-September 1972 Pretest and Mid-May 1973 Posttest

7th Grade Comprehension, Survey D

Grade Equivalent Gains	All 7th Grade N=215		Title I 7th N=132		Non-Title I 7th N=83		A House N=80		B House N=52	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2.5 or more	44	20%	34	26%	10	12%	22	28%	12	23%
1.5 - 2.4	44	20	31	23	13	16	21	26	10	19
.8 - 1.4	40	19	33	25	7	8	22	28	11	21
.1 - .7	23	11	16	12	7	8	9	12	7	13
No gain or regressed	64	30	18	14	46	55	6	8	12	23
Total	215	100%	132	100%	83	99%	80	99%	52	99%

8th Grade Comprehension, Survey E

Grade Equivalent Gains	All 8th Grade N=182		Title I 8th N=97		Non-Title I 8th N=85		A House N=54		B House N=43	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2.5 or more	51	28%	30	31%	21	25%	20	37%	10	23%
1.5 - 2.4	44	24	23	24	21	25	14	26	9	21
.8 - 1.4	21	12	12	12	9	10	4	7	8	19
.1 - .7	21	12	14	14	7	8	9	17	5	12
No gain or regressed	45	25	18	19	27	32	7	13	11	26
Total	182	101%	97	100%	85	100%	54	100%	43	101%

of the 80 A-House students failed to make any gain. Over 60 percent of the B-House students made average or better gains and, again, nearly one of four students gained 2.5 years or more. However, 12 of the 52 B-House students (23 percent) made no gain.

The non-Title I seventh graders did not make gains nearly as impressive as those of the Title I students. Only 36 percent of them made average or better gains and 55 percent of them made no gains at all. However, it should be pointed out that the non-Title I students had a pre-test raw score (46.1) which didn't allow them much room to move upward on a 52-item test.

Forty of the 46 students who made no grade equivalent gains were still above grade level on the post test -- in most cases, two or three years above.

Because many of these students scored near the test limit on the pre-test, it was difficult for them to show gains on the post-test. The high test scores of the non-Title I seventh graders indicate that Survey D of the Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension Test does not accurately measure their knowledge.

Table 6 indicates that 116 of the 182 eighth graders taking the comprehension test made grade equivalent gains of eight months or more. Fifty-one students (28 percent) gained 2.5 years or more, 44 (25 percent) gained between 1.5 and 2.4 years, and 21 (12 percent) gained from .8 to 1.4. One out of four eighth graders made no gain.

The non-Title I eighth graders gained almost as much as the Title I students. Six out of ten non-Title I students gained eight months or more while nearly seven out of ten Title I students gained that much. Fifty percent of the non-Title I students gained 1.5 years or more compared to the 55 percent of the Title I students who made similar gains. The most substantial difference

between the two groups was the number of students making no gain. One out of five Title I students failed to make a gain while nearly one out of three non-Title I students made no gain or regressed.

Table 6 also reveals that 70 percent of the A-House eighth graders and 63 percent of the B-House students made average (.8) or better grade equivalent gains. While these gains were evenly distributed among B-House students (19 percent gained from eight months to a year and four months, 21 percent gained between 1.5 and 2.4 years and 23 percent gained 2.5 years or more) they tended to be unevenly clustered at the top for A-House students (7 percent gained between .8 and 1.4, 26 percent gained between 1.5 and 2.4 years, and 37 percent gained 2.5 years or more). Thirteen percent of the A-House students and twenty-six percent of the B-House students made no gains.